

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 have been examined. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11 have been amended to recite the features of the present invention more clearly. In particular, to clarify the relationship between the “first step” and “second step.” However, no new matter is added. Therefore, Applicants believe no additional search and/or consideration is required regarding the claim amendments.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moshaiov (US 6,678,726). Applicants traverse this rejection.

A. Claim 1

The present invention relates to a detection method of omission-in-software-property-management using a network for detecting a computer omitted from a software-property management which manages, for each computer, basic information thereof and installed software, and fix-patch application status.

Turing to the cited art, the system of Moshaiov provides for a client computer to automatically determine system topology information regarding its location in a message queuing system (i.e., a network) by broadcasting a request to potential servers in its proximity and waiting for a reply (Abstract). That is, if there is a change in the client computer’s transport network, the client computer broadcasts a client request packet from each network address currently being used within the client computer and receives a server reply packet from a server to extract its topology information (Col. 2, lines 4-25; Col. 5, lines 9-35). If no replies are received, then the client computer sends a datagram message to the address of each of the servers stored in its cache to receive a reply from a server on the same site as its last used site (Col. 5, lines 9-35).

More particularly, Moshaiov discloses that the client computer maintains a cache of its last site, its addresses and their connected networks in persistent memory (Col. 5, lines 10-12). A change in network is determined when there is a change in current configuration and the cached configuration (Col. 5, lines 14-17). In other words, the client computer merely compares a detected configuration to a configuration stored in its cache to determine whether it is necessary to detect a new message queuing topology.

Moshaiov discloses a second embodiment which offers a more limited automatic detection mechanism employed for server computers, since server computers are assumed to be static (Col. 2, lines 30-42 and Col. 5, lines 37-62). For example, site information will remain unchanged (Col. 5, lines 38-39). Therefore, Moshaiov discloses that a change in configuration of a server computer is detected in cases when there is a change to a supported network protocol or an addition or deletion of a network interface is detected in a similar fashion as the client computer described above (Col. 2, lines 30-42 and Col. 5, lines 37-62). That is, when a detected server address is different from a server address stored in the cache of the server computer, an administrative event is issued which requires operator intervention to select the proper connected network out of a given list (“a server computer could perform the same automatic detection as a client computer”) (Col. 5, lines 37-62).

The Examiner contends that Moshaiov teaches each feature of claim 1. However, claim 1 describes:

performing a first step wherein a network-connected-computer list which holds, for all computers connected to a given network, information for identifying each computer, and a software-property management list which holds, for all computers to be managed by said software-property management, information for identifying each computer, are used as a basis on which a computer is extracted that is present in said network-connected-computer list and absent in said software-property management list; and performing a second step wherein there is created a list of computer omitted in the software-property management based on the computer extracted in the first step.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that the detection of a change in a server address by the server computer is a detection of an omission of software. Applicants respectfully disagree. As stated above, Moshaiov at best detects that a detected server address of a server computer is different from a server address stored in a cache. The detected server address, however, is not an omission from software-property management, but merely an updated server address indicating that the server computer is connected to different network. Upon detection of a network change (i.e., change in server address), the operator is prompted to select the proper connected network out of a given list of networks (Col. 5, lines 46-52). There is no suggestion that a change in server address is correlated with an omission from software-property management as defined in the claims. Moreover, detection is isolated for that particular server computer. That is, a list of server computers is not generated, but at best a list of connected networks is generated such that one can be selected by an operator to make a connection to the server computer. Even if the desired connection is “omitted” until selected by the operator, the alleged omission does not translate into a computer omitted from a software-property management which manages, for each computer, basic information thereof and installed software, and fix-patch application status. Further, the alleged omission does not establish a basis for generating a software-property management list which holds, for all computers to be managed by said software-property management, information for identifying each computer. That is because the server computer is independently configured to a network, and does not recognize other computers which are not being managed by the software-property management.

The Examiner also asserts that column 8, lines 20-33, of Moshaiov discloses detecting a computer omitted in software-property management by a server on a network, in which the computer omitted in software-property management is a computer connected to the network but not under software-property management. Column 8, lines 20-33, of Moshaiov, however,

relates to a client computer, not a server computer, which has a more limited automatic detection mechanism employed. In particular, the server computer is assumed to be static, and thus, the site of the server computer remains unchanged. As stated above, the server computer merely detects connected networks to be selected by an operator when there is a change in the server address. The client computer, on the other hand, detects when there has been a change in its network. More specifically, the client computer detects when it is connected to a different location in a same network or moved to a different network. When the client computer detects a change, it acquires its new topology information, which merely includes the site and the connected networks upon which the client computer resides. The change in configuration, however, is not an omission from a software-property management which manages, for each computer, basic information thereof and installed software, and fix-patch application status. Instead, the change in configuration is a detection of a new location in a network, which prompts the computer to update its topology information. The topology information does not manage for each computer, basic information thereof and installed software, and fix-patch application status. Furthermore, there is no suggestion that the server of the moved client computer detects an omission in software-property management, as set forth in claim 1.

The Examiner also asserts that the extraction of the site, connected network addresses, and a list of DS servers (i.e., the topology information) from a reply packet by the client computer reads on the software-property management list which holds, for all computers to be managed by said software-property management, information for identifying each computer. The topology information disclosed in column 11, lines 1-15 of Moshaiov, however, merely relates to location (site) of the individual client computer, and its network information (network address and list of DS servers). The topology information does not relate to a list of information for all computers which are being managed by the software-

property management, which manages, for each computer, basic information thereof and installed software, and fix-patch application status. Moshaiov simply makes no disclosure of this feature. In fact, Moshaiov does not disclose a list which includes any information for other computers on the network, but appears to only identify the information related to the location of the client computer on the network. Moreover, the detected change in configuration of the client computer or the server computer does not translate into the claimed software-property management list. The change in configuration is merely a difference in topology information detected by the client computer for the client computer. It is not a list of all computers under the software-property management.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Moshaiov discloses comparing a network-connected-computer list and a software-property management list, and extracting the difference to create a list of computers omitted in the software-property management. In particular, the Examiner asserts that column 5, lines 37-52, of Moshaiov discloses this feature. As stated above, Moshaiov merely discloses comparing a detected configuration with a configuration stored in a cache to determine if the client computer changed its network location or whether a server computer is connected to a different network. A detected configuration and a configuration stored in the cache does not translate into the claimed network-connected-computer list and the software-property management list, and which are compared according to claim 1 to extract a computer for creating a list of computers omitted in the software-property management. Neither the detected configuration or the configuration stored in the cache is disclosed as a list including information for all computers connected to a given network or information for all computers to be managed by said software-property management. The configurations consist of information related merely to the corresponding client computer or server computer.

Also, a configuration stored in the cache does not inherently represent a network-connected-computer list, because the configuration is already changed and the network-connected-computer list includes all computers connected to the network - a deficiency of the out-dated, stored configuration. Similarly, a configuration stored in the cache does not inherently represent a software-property management list, because if there is a change in networks, then the computer would not be included at being managed by software-property management.

Lastly, Moshaiov does not disclose creating a third list. That is, Moshaiov does not disclose creating a list of computers omitted in the software-property management from the basis of extracting a computer that is present in said network-connected-computer list and absent in said software-property management list. Column 8, lines 20-33, of Moshaiov, relates to a client computer, not a server computer, which has a more limited automatic detection mechanism employed (see, col. 5, lines 37-48). In particular, the server computer is assumed to be static, and thus, the site of the server computer remains unchanged. As stated above, the server computer merely detects connected networks to be selected by an operator when there is a change in the server address. Moshaiov at best discloses comparing a detected configuration and a stored configuration, and detecting a difference. If a difference is detected, an operator is prompted to select a connected network out of a give list (col. 5, lines 46-52). That is, the detection merely identifies that a server address is changed, such that an operator can be notified to select a proper connected network. Moshaiov does not disclose that the given list represents a list of computers which are present in said network-connected-computer list and absent in said software-property management list (i.e., the list of computers omitted in the software-property management based on the computer extracted in the first step).

In view of the foregoing, Moshaiov fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be patentable for at least this reason.

B Claims 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11

In addition, independent claims 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11 recite that the network-connected-computer list and the software-property management list are used as a basis on which a computer is extracted that is present in said network-connected-computer list and absent in said software-property management list, which is not disclosed by Moshaiov for reasons similar to those presented above in conjunction with claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11 are patentable for at least this reason.

C. Claims 2, 4, 7-9, 12-16 and 18-19

Applicants also submit that dependent claims 2, 4, 7-9, 12-16 and 18-19 are patentable at least by virtue of the dependencies.

D. Claim 17

Applicants also submit that dependent claim 17 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

Furthermore, claim 17 recites that “the computer not under software-property management includes a computer operating under with an unknown operating system, software version, or patch-application status.” The Examiner asserts that this is disclosed by a unique identifier of the site which the client computer belongs on column 8, lines 45-55 of Moshaiov. The Examiner, however, asserts that the features of claim 1 relate to the embodiment corresponding to the server computer, as opposed to the client computer. As such, the server computer is assumed to be static, and thus, the site of the server computer remains unchanged. Therefore, the limited detection mechanism disclosed in Moshaiov would not include this feature with the static server computer. Moreover, a unique identifier of a site (i.e., identifying a location within a network) does not correlate into a computer

having or operating under an unknown operating system, software version, or patch-application status.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ryan F. Heavener
Registration No. 61,512

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 8, 2008